

1. Film: Food Inc.
Director: Robert Kenner
Release Year: 2008

2. What is the central argument or narrative of the film?

The main argument of this film was to reveal the truth behind the industrial food system in America. It focuses on the change in food production as a result of the growth in the fast food industry over the last 50 years. It also addresses the fact that most of the food production in America is controlled by a small amount of corporations whose main goal is to make the most annual profit possible at the lowest expense by producing large quantities of food at low input cost. This business strategy allows these companies to dominate the global supply of food sources, however, the health and safety of the animals and workers involved are often overlooked. This issue directly involves the consumers who eat the food that is produced by these companies, who may be exposed to food with sanitary or health risks. The film attempts to give the consumer a better idea of where their food actually comes from, and how it makes its way from the farm to their plates. It also exposes the industry's relationship with pollution, pesticides, genetically modified crops, labor and animal abuse, and the corruption in governmental policy that allows these companies to produce cheap food regardless of the consequences or health risks of consumers.

3. How is the argument or narrative made and sustained? How much scientific information is provided, for example? Does the film have emotional appeal?

The argument of the film is sustained by all of the factual information that it provides to the viewers about the meat industry, the produce industry, and governmental policies. The argument is also sustained by direct interviews with farmers and chicken coop owners, which provided a real life insight into the issue, something that many viewers are affected by. The argument focuses on one main fact, that the food industry does not want you to know the truth about what you are eating, because if you did you might not eat it. The film most definitely has emotional appeal to the viewer by showing the disturbing images of the mistreatment of animals. These images raise the ethical issue of animal rights, and even human health as these animals are eventually consumed by humans.

**4. What sustainability problems does the film draw out?
Political? Legal? Economic? Technological? Media and Informational?
Organizational? Educational? Behavioral? Cultural? Ecological?**

This film focuses on all of the sustainability issues named above. Though it mainly focuses on the economic business strategies of the industry leaders, the governmental policies that allow these industries to prosper, and the ecological and health problems that result, the film also underlines issues of ignorance and greed in our culture, as well as ending with possible ways to change things through information and education.

5. What parts of the film did you find most persuasive and compelling? Why?

One part of the film that I found most compelling was the attempt to uncover the world of modern agriculture. The film digs deep into products sold at supermarkets, and how approximately 90% of processed food products contain a soybean or corn ingredient. This is a result of government policies that pay farmers to overproduce the corn crop, which is grown on over 30% of the US land base. A major problem in our supermarkets and grocery stores is that candy, chips and soda are cheaper than produce, because commodity crops such as corn, wheat, and soybeans, which are found in snack foods, are heavily subsidized. This is the reason why the largest factor involved with obesity is income level. Modern agriculture is all about doing things faster, bigger and cheaper, without thought of health risks of the people. I found this most interesting because nobody really thinks of the agriculture industry as anything other than just growing crops.

6. What parts of the film were you not compelled or convinced by? Why?

If anything, I felt that I was not convinced by the film's effort to help the consumer pick out their food. The film was very efficient in telling the viewer where their food came from, but it could have explained more about what to look for in supermarkets that is good to eat.

7. What audiences does the film best address? Why?

This film would best address all audiences, because all age groups, especially children, are at risk of health issues related to policies in the food industries. However, due to some disturbing images, young children should probably not watch the film.

8. What could have been added to this film to enhance its environmental educational value?

The film could have included more information about the consequences of pesticides used in agriculture, mainly their effects on areas surrounding the farms. It could have also talked more about the possible health risks of GMO's, and how exactly the food industry won the right to not label food as GMO.

9. What kinds of action and points of intervention are suggested by the film? If the film itself does not suggest corrective action, describe actions that you can imagine being effective.

The film makes the viewer understand that they have the power to vote against these industries by choosing to buy local and organic foods for their daily meals. It focuses on the importance of cooking a meal with your family and eating healthier food.

10. What additional information has this film compelled you to seek out? (Provide at least two supporting references)

I was compelled to seek out more information regarding the laws that protect the food industry, including the Veggie Libel Laws , and the food industries fight to not have to label their products.

<http://www.mtsusidelines.com/opinions/veggie-libel-laws-legal-disaster-1.936693#.TrRYILJY8o4>

<http://www.landinstitute.org/vnews/display.v/ART/2002/10/18/3db994e62c284>